

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated June 8, 2009 is respectfully requested. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 8 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,907,322 (“Kelly”). Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claims 4 and 6 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kelly in view of USP 5,895,462 (“Toki”).

In response to the Office Action, Applicant amended claims 1 and 5 without acquiescing in the Examiner’s reasons for rejections. Accordingly, claims 1-8 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

More specifically, the claims have been amended to recite “soliciting from an advertiser” a “predetermined set of web site identifiers.” Support for the amendment can be found, for example, on page 5 of the Specification, first full paragraph, through page 8, line 2.

The Examiner relied solely on the Kelly reference in rejecting the subject claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Although Kelly’s teachings have certain similar aspects as the subject invention, the two are patentably different.

Kelly does not use a predetermined set of web site identifiers. In addition, Kelly does not solicit from advertisers. Kelly’s database is compiled from existing data such as “TV advertisement schedules,” “TV show schedules,” “TV advertisers’ websites,” etc. Col. 3, lines 11-15. Kelly’s system performs its search automatically by comparing these existing data with the TV advertisement schedule to determine the TV advertisement broadcast desired. Col. 3, lines 19-23.

In comparison, the subject invention provides a directed search engine that is based on a predetermined set of identifiers. Instead of a general search which may generate irrelevant results, the subject system provides guided search parameters for the user to retrieve the desired information, as recited in the claims. By limiting the search

parameters to a predetermined set of keywords or “identifiers,” and by having such identifiers already in association with certain websites in the database, a search result is much more accurate and readily available.

As such, Kelly teaches away from the subject invention and, thus, does not anticipate the subject invention and cannot alone or in combination with another reference render the present invention obvious.

The undersigned respectfully request a telephone interview with the Examiner at the Examiner’s earliest convenience to further clarify this patentable difference between Kelly and the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,

The Law Offices of K. W. Wang



Dated: December 8, 2009

By Karry. W. Wang
Reg. No. 50,178
3342 Park Ridge Dr.
Richmond, CA 94806
Tel: (510) 223-8818
kwang@kwwang.com